

the Lower House was then pleased to impose on those Objects of Tax, as being too liable to Abuse, and greatly above the Proportion they ought to bear. We wish, *Gentlemen*, you would pay some Regard to Truth and Decency, at least while you aspire to the Rights and Privileges of the *British House of Commons*. The Truth is, as far as we can judge from the whole Tenor of your Conduct, both within Doors and without, that you are endeavouring to persuade your Constituents, the frequent Miscarriages of this your favourite Bill, are owing only to a Dispute between the Lord Proprietary and the Great Officers of this Government of one Part, and yourselves on the other, upon the Point of Taxing, or not Taxing, his Estate and their Offices, to cover which (*viz.* Objections in 1758 to Taxing those two Objects) you say most of the others were only thrown in as a Barrier; whereas, we now repeat, that no Objection has been made to Taxing either of those Particulars; neither his Lordship, nor those Great Officers you refer to, having any Objection, that we know of, against a proportional Tax either upon his Estate or their Offices; for the Objections you would have thus understood, are only to the Manner, and the Quantum, then proposed, considerably above the Proportion at which other People were to have been taxed; and to prevent, as far as possible, every future Opportunity of Poisoning the Minds of the People, by thus imposing upon their Understandings, permit us to inform you, That the true general Question in Debate, is, Whether the Lord Proprietor, the Upper House, and People, shall be subjected to a new and unconstitutional Power of Oppression, without any Remedy, or not? The Parties are the two Houses, the Lower House has been contending for the Affirmative, and this House for the Negative, in Nine successive Struggles upon this important Question.

A Concern upon a Disappointment in any of your sanguine Pursuits being natural, we can easily credit your Expression of Sorrow, that (what you call) an occasional Waver of your Rights, in respect to the Mode of Proceeding on Money Bills, has not had the Effect you desired, from our unhappily (instead of proposing Objections or Amendments to your Money Bill, pursuant to the Leave you had given us) disputing the Rights you assume in respect to such Bills, and thereby obstructing the Establishment of such a Claim: Had you indeed waved your obstinate Adherence to your unwarrantable Assessment Bill, and paid a due Regard to our former Objections, so far as they were applicable, your Waver had been of real Importance to his Majesty's Service, and your own Credit, and might have afforded us some Encouragement to add our Assistance in promoting so laudable a Design; but we must take the Liberty to tell you, that you have waved nothing upon this Occasion, because you had nothing to wave; for your Claim of the same Rights with the *British House of Commons* (tho' you seem inclined for the present to allow us those of the *British House of Lords*) will avail nothing, because having different Foundations, no Inference can be fairly drawn from the Rights of one to establish the Claims of the other: The House of Commons have a Law peculiar to themselves, called *Lex Parliamenti*, which is, we presume, founded on the antient Usages of that particular Body: If you should be pleased to be called the House of Commons, we think you would gain nothing by such a Measure, because, as the House of Commons of *Maryland*, would still be a distinct Body from the House of Commons of *Great-Britain*, we do not perceive how assuming the Appellation of the *British House of Commons*, will transfer to you that *Lex Parliamenti* of the House of Commons in *Britain*; their antient Usages not being your Usages; and perhaps they might be offended, if not at the Assumption of their Name, yet at assuming the *Lex Parliamenti*, which they may be apt to consider as a Right peculiar to themselves; your Rights, *Gentlemen*, are founded only in the Royal Charter, your particular Usages, and the Common Law of *England*: What those Rights are, the Charter, Journals, and Law Books, may inform you; but we shrewdly suspect, you will be so far from supporting your extraordinary Claims from either of them, that the Charter and Journals in particular will operate strongly against them, and tend to support that Part of our last Message, with which you seem to have been so highly offended; and here, upon your Intimation that you had not Time at present to look fully into the Matter, we leave you to cultivate an Acquaintance with your own Journals, where you will undoubtedly find sufficient Evidence, from the earliest to the present Times, to destroy all Pretence of Right to your exorbitant Claims; that the Body now called the Lower House, and that now called the Upper House, were Coeval; that after several Years Consideration, our Constitution was established in it's present Form; ever since which, the Upper House has been a Constitutional Check upon any frantic Humour that might seize the Lower House; and we are well satisfied, that at this particular Season, every sensible Man applauds the Foresight and Wisdom of our Ancestors in that Establishment.

The earliest Establishment of our Constitution being in it's present Form, your Objection to the Upper House as a dependant Branch of the Legislature, becomes the more ridiculous; and when it is considered that the several Legislatures in *British America* (except one, or two at most) consist of three Branches, and that the middle Branch in each (three Instances only excepted) is appointed in like Manner with ourselves, we hope you will not think an Upper House a Misfortune peculiar to this Province, nor expect to persuade